977.178
K58w

R. King

When and By Whom Was Cincinnati Founded?

Ratt

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below.

University of Illinois Library

APR 25 1956

MAY 15 1956

OCT 19 1999

AUG 30 1999

L161—H41

977.178
K56W

When, and by Whom, was Cincinnati Founded?

AN ADDRESS to the Pioneer Association of Cincinnati, April 7th, 1882. By Rufus King.

For the brief contribution, which I shall offer you to-day, I have selected a subject not only without novelty, but which, indeed, may long since have become a settled point with many of you. Nevertheless, I trust it may be deemed appropriate to this interesting occasion, and, possibly, productive of some practical result.

When and by whom was Cincinnati founded, is the subject proposed.

This Association, it is understood, recognizes the 28th of December, 1788, as the date of the first settlement of the town: and why, you may ask, is there any further question about it?

In reply, it is to be said that the Association is not understood ever to have formally considered or decided the question, even for themselves, but have accepted this date rather in deference to the supposed authority of William McMillan, one of the first settlers of the town, and a man of intelligence and high standing. On the other hand we have Judge Burnet's statement that the landing of the first settlers, here, was on the 24th of December, 1788: and Doctor Drake and Governor Chase, highly respectable authorities, who must be presumed to have informed themselves whereof they spoke, both fixed the date on December 26th in that year: which day, fifty years ago, was recognized and publicly celebrated here as the anniversary.—But Col. Patterson and Col. Israel Ludlow, the two leaders of the party, distinctly stated, as we shall see, that they landed here in January 1789.

Writers, in later years, have taken sides for each and all of these dates. The Rev. James H. Perkins, in his

"Western Annals,"—a work by all odds more full, more accurate, and more generally satisfactory than any other one book on the early history of the West—after comparing these conflicting statements, sums it up as a curious fact that the date of the settlement of Cincinnati is unknown, even though we have the testimony of the very men who made it.— *Western Annals*, 308.

But it will not do to give it up. In the grand round of Centennials which is passing over the country, Cincinnati also must have her day. It will not be many years before our turn will come; and it becomes our citizens to adopt timely measures for ascertaining and establishing our city's birthday.

In such an investigation it is not assuming too much to believe that there is no portion of the community who may more properly lead the way, or to whom the others will more willingly defer the lead, than this Association.

What I would, therefore, beg leave to propose is that this Association shall undertake this office; and that, after gathering all the light which their means and opportunities can bring to bear upon it, they shall formally announce their conclusion, as to the day we should celebrate, for the guidance or benefit of our fellow-citizens, when they come to determine the proper time.

To this practical object my remarks to-day will be directed, and I shall simply present to you a sketch of some facts and dates which may serve as a beginning of the inquiry, hoping to show where the difficulty lies in determining it: and if it really be insuperable, then to point out a solution which may, perhaps, answer the purpose in view of fixing our Centennial.

It seems, at this day, a wonder, considering the fertility and beauty of the Miami Valley, and the attractions which this particular spot presented to the eyes of the hardy pioneers, as they floated past on the gentle current of the Ohio, that the settlement here was not made sooner than it happened; and especially that the Marietta Colony, whose anniversary we keep to-day, should have given the preference to the hilly and broken region which they chose.

There is a tradition that they consulted Zane, who was one of the foremost and most sagacious of the land operators North-west of the Ohio, and that he advised them to try the Miami country. But, according to the story, they were under a shrewd impression that as his interests were chiefly on the upper Ohio, he wanted a barrier between himself and the Indians, and they concluded to plant themselves on the Muskingum.

The truth is that immediately after the cession of the North-west Territory to the United States by the treaty of peace with Great Britain, a fierce and bloody conflict, largely instigated by British emissaries and agents, arose between the Indian tribes in that Territory and the settlers of Kentucky. In this war the Miami Valley, and particularly the lower part, along the Ohio, became exceedingly dangerous ground, and indeed was a sealed book, little known to the whites. The constant raids and incursions by the Indians across the Ohio, at this point, and the retaliatory expeditions by which the Kentuckians, under bold leaders like George Rogers Clarke, struck back at their savage foe, had given to this vicinity the significant appellation of the "Miami Slaughter House."

It might be interesting, but our time will not now admit of it, to go back to various early glimpses of these rich and luxuriant landscapes, which we get from the narrative of Christopher Gist, the expert woodsman, who in March, 1751, traveled down the Little Miami, prospecting for choice lands for his employers, the Ohio Company, and who speaks of the fertile meadows on its banks, where he saw herds of buffalo feeding in the white clover, wild rye and blue grass; or the grander pageant of three hundred French and Indians, under the command of DeCeloron, who were sent by the Governor of Canada, in 1749, across Lake Erie and Lake Chautauqua and down the waters of the Allegheny and the Ohio rivers, to assert the dominion and possession of this country for the French Government; burying at the mouth of the chief tributaries of the Ohio, as they passed along, leaden plates inscribed with the purpose of their mission, and which turned its fleet of batteaux's up

P 4044

the Great Miami (marked on their map as the river LaRoche) and in September, 1749 navigated that stream up to Loramie, thence crossing the portage to the Maumee and returning to Canada; or what must have been the far more imposing display, in 1780, of sixty-three boats carrying 1,000 men with their families down the Ohio to the falls, so graphically described by General Lytle, then a youth, and one of the adventurers, and in which an exciting episode occurred by an encounter with the Indians on the site of Cincinnati.

These are digressions which must be passed over. But finally there came an incident which broke the spell resting upon the Miamis, and which I wish I could notice more fully, not only for its romance, but being so closely connected with our subject; for upon it the foundation of Cincinnati followed and depended.

Observe, that as late as the year 1786, this valley continued to be not only untenanted by the emigrant, but otherwise than as the great war-path was comparatively unknown.

John Cleves Symmes, of New Jersey, as is well known, applied to Congress, at New York, on the 29th of August, 1787, for the Miami Purchase, encouraged, his petition stated, by their action in the previous month in favor of the Marietta Colony of Messrs. Sargent, Cutler and Company.

But how or why Judge Symmes became inspired with this enterprise is not so generally known. And the incident to which I allude was the bold exploit of Major Benjamin Stites, also a hardy son of New Jersey, so well described by your respected President, Daniel Gano, in his address at your annual meeting in April, 1871—an exploit which entitles him to be distinguished as the man who opened the way to the Miami Purchase. I need only remind you that, as a volunteer, merely, he joined a party of Kentuckians in the pursuit of some Indian horse-thieves across the Ohio and up the Little Miami river, but being unsuccessful they crossed over and returned by way of the Great Miami. Delighted with his view of the land, Major Stites

returned immediately to New Jersey and made known his discovery to Judge Symmes, a leading citizen of that state, but not, as is commonly supposed, a member of Congress at that time, his term of office having expired in the previous year. He saw at once the value and importance of the information, but before entering into the project, he descended the Ohio river as far as the Falls, stopping and carefully examining the northern shore between the Miamis. Thoroughly satisfied that Stites had not overdrawn the picture, Judge Symmes, on his return, applied in behalf of himself and his associates for the purchase of the entire body of land on the Ohio river, between the Great and Little Miami rivers.

Relying that this grant would be made, and without awaiting the answer, he entered into a contract with Stites on the 9th of November, 1787, to sell him ten thousand acres on the Ohio and Little Miami rivers; and in January, 1788, contracted with Matthias Denman, of Essex county, New Jersey, to sell him the entire section of land situated opposite the mouth of the Licking river, reserving for himself a large tract at the mouth of the Great Miami. Each of them had the same object in view in putting themselves at the mouth of these rivers, and three rival towns were at once projected at these points.

But the Treasury Board, which had charge of sales of the public lands, would not grant the entire front on the Ohio between the Miamis, their policy being to extend the grants more into the interior; and after delaying the contract until the 15th of May, 1788, they then limited its width to twenty miles only, on the Ohio, to be measured by its meanders, from the mouth of the Great Miami. This was a disappointment, which for years made much difficulty and loss to Judge Symmes, though the entire distance was finally conceded by the Government.

Thus we have the inception and the dates, introducing the several schemes which were now coming forward to bid for the favor of posterity; and during the summer of 1788, Symmes and Stites and Denman were all busy with organizing and preparations for the start.

Symmes having been appointed one of the judges in the Territorial Government established by Congress, was delayed, but Stites and Denman were at Limestone, now known as Maysville, in August; the former, with his strong party of friends and followers, vigorously making every thing ready for building and equipping his settlement immediately on reaching the ground. Thus he was foremost, and on the 18th of November, 1788, despite the alarm of Indian opposition, which had been raised against him, he landed them safely at Columbia, and in a few days had them housed for the winter and fortified against the enemy.

Judge Symmes, with his large party, had reached Limestone early in September. Denman, with whom our fortunes were now to be more particularly involved, had brought no party with him, but by skillful generalship he executed a flank movement, which brought him new elements of strength, and, no doubt, much of his subsequent success.

Passing over to Lexington, Kentucky, he there united himself in partnership with two citizens of that place: Colonel Robert Patterson, a native of Bedford county, Pennsylvania, who about the year 1780 founded the City of Lexington, a gentleman of high character, standing, and influence among the people of Kentucky, and distinguished as a gallant soldier; and John Filson, a native of Chester county, Pennsylvania, who had begun life as a schoolmaster, but had early emigrated to Kentucky. Besides being a surveyor and considerable dealer in lands, he was the author of the first history of the adventures of Daniel Boone and of the settlement of Kentucky, published in 1784. A formal contract by these three associates, headed "with reference to Losantiville," was executed at Lexington, on the 25th of August, 1788, by which Denman, in consideration of twenty pounds, Virginia currency, to be paid to him by Patterson and Filson, sold to them two-thirds of his purchase under Symmes; and it was solemnly stipulated that "every institution, determination, and regulation respecting the laying-off a town, and establishing a ferry upon the premises, should be the result and united advice and concert of the parties."

Thus was Cincinnati incubated, and it was by the name and style of Losantiville. There is no doubt of this fact, though stoutly disputed by some of our distinguished antiquarians. The paper proves it.

Next appeared an advertisement in the *Kentucky Gazette*, at Lexington, August 30th, 1788, signed by the three proprietors, announcing that they have "determined to lay off a town" opposite the mouth of Licking river, and that an inlot of half an acre and an outlot of four acres will be given to each of the first thirty settlers who become residents before the 1st day of April following. They also announce that on September 15th a large company was to assemble at Lexington, and proceed to mark out a road to the mouth of Licking, provided Judge Symmes arrived, he being expected daily.

By a subsequent advertisement in the *Kentucky Gazette*, September 13th, Col. Patterson announced, that the day of departure was changed to the 18th, so as to meet Judge Symmes at the mouth of Licking, on Monday, the 22d, "agreeable to his appointment, and the business will then go on as proposed." Please observe the words for they were exactly followed up and fulfilled.

Col. Patterson and Filson rode over at the head of an armed company of Kentuckians. Judge Symmes, Denman and Israel Ludlow, with their company, came down the Ohio river from Limestone.

On Monday, the 22d day of September, in the year 1788, these different interests assembled on the ground so designated, pursuant to the covenant and determination so drawn up and signed, and the public announcement and invitation so advertised.

Then and there, I submit, was the foundation of Cincinnati; solemnized by this demonstration, never relinquished, but executed and carried out, even in the name of the town, as we shall find, in conformity with the original design concluded at Lexington, on the 25th of August.

Here, on his part, that day stood Symmes, recognized as the representative of the Government title, ready to make the project good: and there with him was Israel

Ludlow, his head surveyor and adviser in the laying out of the Miami Purchase. There, on the other part, were Denman, Patterson and Filson, the recognized proprietors by purchase from Symmes, of the town site: Filson holding the projected plat in his hand. And there, also, were the expectants of the half acre in-lots and four acre out-lots promised to the brave thirty who, before the 1st day of April following were to venture in as residents; saying nothing of the other attendants who on such occasions always take an interest on behalf of the public. Surely this was worthy enough to be dignified as the foundation of the town.

But before the actual settlement could be formed two things had to be ascertained: first, where was the twenty mile point above the mouth of the Great Miami; second, and still more important, where were the lines of the section upon which the town plat was to be laid off. In other words, while it was pretty well understood that Losantiville fell within the twenty mile limit, no lots could be donated or settled upon until they were located upon the ground.

Part of the assembly, therefore, remained in camp. It would seem there was already a block-house on the spot, erected by some previous party campaigning against the Indians. Another party under Messrs. Denman and Ludlow proceeded to measure the courses and meanders of the Ohio and about ten miles up the Great Miami. Another and larger party of armed men, under Judge Symmes, Col. Patterson and Filson, went back into the country to examine the interior and its topography. A number of the Kentuckians, in this party, for some reason not explained, possibly that which is referred to by Mr. Perkins, in his Annals, *pp.* 307, 308, and by Judge Symmes in his report May 18th, 1789, hereinafter mentioned, turned back on the second or third day. Whether Filson was with them does not appear, though Judge Symmes intimates not, but in some way he became separated. When all the various parties, after a few days, reassembled at the camp opposite the Licking, Filson was missing; and though reported and always since understood to have been killed by an Indian, I can not discover that any one saw it, or that his body

was found; and to this day the actual fate of the unfortunate man is a mystery.

But it is a mistake to suppose that Filson's loss broke off or defeated the project. It became necessary, of course, to suspend the settlement until his right and interest in the purchase could be disposed of and a surveyor put in his place, and, fortunately, the right man was at hand. Whether if Filson had not perished, it was intended, or even possible to have effected the laying off and settlement of the town, at that time, seems questionable. The surveys and computations necessary for adjusting the townships and sections, and thus locating the lines of the town section and plat, with its streets and squares and lots, could hardly have been completed at once: and even had this been practicable, it is evident, from the extended time given for settlers to come in and secure the donations of lots, that a settlement was not expected to follow immediately.

The meeting adjourned, but "the business" was not abandoned. Messrs. Denman and Patterson went to Limestone, where they were soon after joined by Messrs. Symmes and Ludlow. Negotiations took place by which the brother of Filson, who was the executor of his will, surrendered his right, and Israel Ludlow became the purchaser, and by agreement of all parties took Filson's place as one of the three proprietors of the town. All legal arrangements having been satisfactorily adjusted for going on to complete and lay off the town according to the original agreement, and, in fact, very nearly in accordance with Filson's original plat, Mr. Denman returned to New Jersey, leaving full power and authority to his two associates to act, Mr. Ludlow being his special agent, in perfecting the project with the public as first proposed.

During the months of October and November Mr. Ludlow, who now was to be the active man in the Losantiville scheme, revised Filson's plat, introducing some changes, but, what was more material, he had ascertained the precise location of the section (and fractional section intervening between it and the river) which the proprietors of the town were entitled to have under the purchase from

Judge Symmes; and by which the east line of the section and of the town plat became fixed where the intersection of Broadway and Front street now is; Broadway on the plat being sixteen feet wide and called Eastern Row, as the oldest inhabitants will remember.

Thus far facts and dates, notwithstanding some discrepancies here and there in the authorities, are quite clear. But at this juncture the history of the "Settlement" runs into a fog of contradictions which, as Mr. Perkins tells us, is all but impenetrable; and we shall therefore have to move with great caution among the snags which surround us in our exploration.

We have the authority of Judge Symmes, in a long letter or report to his associates in New Jersey, written at North Bend, May 18th, 1789, that "on the 24th of December last," using his words, "Col. Patterson, of Lexington, who is concerned with Mr. Denman in the section at the mouth of the Licking river, sailed from Limestone in company with Mr. Tuttle, Capt. Henry, Mr. Ludlow and about twelve others, in order to form a station and lay out a town opposite Licking."

If this were all there would be little difficulty in assuming that this party may have reached their destination by the 28th, as Mr. McMillan is supposed to have stated.—But Judge Symmes proceeds to say,—"they suffered much from the inclemency of the weather and floating ice, which filled the Ohio from shore to shore. Perseverance, however, triumphed over difficulty: they landed safe on a most delightful high bank of the Ohio, where they founded the town of Losantiville,—which populates considerably."

But when? unhappily the Judge omits the present *desideratum*: not disclosing when it was that this party landed safe from this perilous and evidently protracted passage. The compliment which he pays to that "delightful high bank" will be appreciated from the fact that in the meanwhile the great flood of the Ohio, in January, 1789, had submerged his metropolis at the mouth of the Great Miami, and also Major Stites' embryo city at Columbia, whilst Losantiville had proudly stood high and dry, and

thereby gained a *prestige*, which justly entitled it, as Judge Symmes quaintly said, to "populate considerably," and tended most materially to secure its triumph over its rivals.

Here we miss the pen of the unfortunate Filson, who being a ready writer, and fond occasionally of his diary, would never have missed the opportunity for a note such as this occasion afforded.

So far as yet made known, the only direct information which we have as to the time of the arrival of this party, is the testimony taken in a chancery suit, which arose some fifteen years afterward between the town and Mr. Joel Williams, concerning "the common," or what is now called the Public Landing.

The town plat was not recorded until April, 1802. Mr. Williams, who had purchased the rights of Denman and Patterson, proposed to divide the Common into lots and sell them: and with that view took possession and proceeded to erect buildings and fences upon a part of it. Mr. Ludlow resisted this and put upon record his plat, founded upon Filson's plat, showing that from the very beginning the Common had been left open and public as to all the space from Front street down to the Ohio river between Broadway and Main street.

The suit for an injunction against Mr. Williams was brought by Judge Burnet, in the name of the town. To establish the fact that the Common had been dedicated by the proprietors to public use, the depositions of all three of them, and of six others of the earlier settlers, were taken by Judge Burnet himself, as stated by him in a subsequent document.

William McMillan was the first who testified, and his statement was that "he was one of those who formed the settlement of Cincinnati on the 28th day of December, 1788."

The testimony of Israel Ludlow was taken subsequently. After stating his purchase of one-third of the town site, he said that "in the month of January, 1789, this deponent together with Robert Patterson, Esq., who was also a proprietor, etc., landed on said ground with a number of

others to lay out the town of Cincinnati and form a settlement thereon." On the same day Col. Patterson made his deposition, agreeing almost literally with Mr. Ludlow in the passage above quoted, his words being that "in the month of January, 1789, he, together with Israel Ludlow, who was also a proprietor of one-third, and agent of Matthias Denman, landed on the ground for the purpose of laying off the town of Cincinnati." Matthias Denman, in his deposition, stated that the town was laid out in 1789, but this is vague and merely hearsay, as he had returned to New Jersey. Ephraim Kibby, who was one of the party, testified that "sometime in the year 1789 Israel Ludlow and Robert Patterson, with many others, met at what is now called Cincinnati, for the purpose of settling the said town," and he adds, "then called Losantiville."

Without presuming to express an opinion as to the time when these first settlers did arrive and land here, yet upon these statements, if compared by the rules usually applied in weighing testimony, the 28th of December can not be confidently or even satisfactorily adopted as the anniversary of that event. It may be that Mr. McMillan's date is right, but, as the matter now stands, his statement can not outweigh the joint testimony of Messrs. Patterson and Ludlow. For whilst they state clearly and unequivocally that they "landed on the ground in January, 1789," Mr. McMillan's expression that he was one of those "who formed the settlement on the 28th of December, 1788," is somewhat ambiguous, and may or may not have referred to the arrival and landing.

Mr. Cist had no doubt that Mr. McMillan has given us the proper date, for the reason that he was an intelligent lawyer and magistrate, and a man of scrupulously exact habits of business. No doubt this was so, but as to intelligence and accuracy he had no advantage over either Patterson or Ludlow. Mr. Cist further remarks that Judge Burnet had assured him that he never entertained a doubt that this was the correct date; but evidently there was some misunderstanding here, for the Judge, in his "Notes on the Early Settlement of the North-western Territory,"

p. 46, distinctly states that this party "landed on the north bank of the Ohio, opposite the mouth of Licking, on the 24th of December, 1788." This upsets all the depositions.

Having thus landed you, my venerable friends, upon this very high, though not delightful bank, I will not distress you further with the fatiguing dispute, but, in conclusion, will venture to offer the following suggestions for your consideration, or for action, if any appear to you to be proper in the matter:

First. That the City of Cincinnati should justly and gratefully recognize Matthias Denman, Robert Patterson, John Filson, and Israel Ludlow, as its founders.

Second. That the foundation of the town, proclaimed and inaugurated by the formal meeting held here for that purpose, on the 22d day of September, 1788, and never for a moment relinquished, renders that anniversary appropriate for celebration as the original institution of the city.

Third. If, however, the settlement of the town, instead of its foundation, be preferred as more worthy of celebration, that the Association take measures for obtaining further evidence on the subject, by causing a thorough search for letters or other documents of the first settlers, among their families or others who may have possession or knowledge of any such evidence, and that a committee of the Association be appointed for that purpose.

Upon the question of adopting the settlement of the town, rather than its first formal foundation, as most worthy of commemoration, permit me to add a few words.

The mere landing of this party from Limestone, whether it occurred in December, 1788, or January, 1789, has but little significance or relevancy to the main consideration. In other words, their arrival and landing was merely incidental to the previously settled plan, and, moreover, by no means made a "settlement." This is best proved by showing what Cincinnati really was a month afterwards, as described in an interesting little sketch by Mrs. Rebecca Reeder, addressed by her to this Association many years ago, and from which I take this extract:

"My father, mother, and seven children landed at Cincinnati, then called *Lasantiville*, on the 8th of February, 1789. The first persons we saw after landing were Mr. McMillan and Mr. Israel Ludlow, one of the proprietors of the place. These two gentlemen were the surveyors of the Miami Purchase. There were three little cabins here when we landed, where the surveyors and chain-carriers lived. They had no floors in their cabins. There were three other women here beside my mother. Their names were Miss Dement, Mrs. Conney Zenes (afterwards married to Mr. McMillan), Mrs. Pesthal, a German woman, and my mother, Mrs. Rebecca Reeder. There were but two families that had small children: they were the German family and my father's family.

"Mr. Ludlow came down to our boat and invited my father and family up to stay in their cabin until we could get one built; but my mother thought they could remain more comfortable with their small children in their boat. So we lived in our boat until the ice began to run, and then we were forced to contrive some other way to live. What few men there were here got together and knocked our boats up and built us a camp. We lived in our camp six weeks. Then my father built us a large cabin, which was the first cabin large enough for a family to live in. We took the boards of our camp and made floors in our house. Father intended to have built it on the corner of Walnut and Water streets, but not knowing exactly where the streets were, he built our house right in the middle of Water street. The streets were laid out, but the woods were so very thick, and the streets were not opened, so it was impossible to tell where the streets would be.

"At the time we landed here the army was stationed at North Bend. The army was in a suffering condition from the want of bread. * * The first summer after we came here, which was 1789, the people suffered very much for want of bread, and as for meat, they had none at all, only just as they killed it in the woods; that was all they had to eat.

"I will close by saying my name, which was Rebecca Kennedy, daughter of Francis Kennedy, now is Rebecca Reeder, widow of Reuben Reeder."

The following extract is from a letter by Thomas Irwin, of Butler county, published in Cist's "Miscellany," Vol. II., p. 22:

"When I was about seventeen years of age, James Burnes and I, from Washington county, Pennsylvania, landed at Cincinnati between the 1st and 10th of April, 1789, and remained there until the second week in June. * * There were but four families there when we landed: Mr. McHenry and his family, a large family, two sons and two daughters, all grown; Mr. Kennedy and a small (young) family;

Mr. Dement and a small family; Mr. Ross and a small family. Mr. McMillan, John Vance, David Logan, Mr. Reeves, Hardesty, Van Eaton, and McConnell, all lived in one shanty, being, perhaps, the first that was put up in the place, as nearly all of them had been out with the surveyors surveying Symmes' Purchase, and were there when the town was laid out, and all had lots in it."

These reports indicate that in the first half of the year 1789, there was very little settlement here to boast of; and if in celebrating the first settlement we would pay honor to the fact rather than an ideality, I think it will be found, upon investigation, that it amounted to little or nothing until the occupation of this point as a military post by Major Doughty, with two companies of United States troops under Captains Strong and Ferguson. This event usually figures in the annals as having occurred in June, 1789, but it was certainly later. By an extract from the diary of Major Denny, then an officer at Fort Harmar (Marietta), it appears that Major Doughty left that post on the 11th of August, 1789, "for the purpose of choosing ground and laying out a new work for the protection of persons who have settled in Judge Symmes' purchase." General Harmar, in a letter to the Secretary of War, September 12, 1789, reports:

"Major Doughty informs me in his letter dated the 27th ultimo, that he arrived at the Little Miami on the 16th, and after reconnoitering for three days from thence to the Big Miami for an eligible situation, whereon to erect the works for headquarters, he had at length determined to fix upon a spot opposite Licking river, which he represents as high and healthy, abounding with never-failing springs, etc., and the most proper position he could find for the purpose."

This settled the town and its future. The ground chosen was the tract of fifteen acres adjoining the town, at the East End, and extending from Fourth street down to the Ohio river. Here Fort Washington was erected in the autumn of 1789. General Harmar, with three hundred additional troops, arrived and occupied it on the 29th of December.

On the 2d of January, 1790, General St. Clair, Gover-

nor of the Territory, with the judges, arrived here on an official visitation, which lasted only three days. During this visit, and by his authority and order, as appears from a letter written in the following week by Symmes, he being, as already mentioned, one of the judges, the County of Hamilton was established, and the county-seat fixed at this town, to which the Governor then gave the name of CINCINNATI.

APPENDIX.

A Committee of the Pioneer Association has been appointed to obtain further information as to the date of the settlement of Cincinnati. They respectfully request the co-operation of all persons who may have it in their power to contribute or point out any means of information.

The list of the first settlers of the town, which was published in the Directory of 1819, contains the following names, besides those of Messrs. Patterson and Ludlow.

NOAH BADGELY,	WILLIAM McMILLAN,
SAMUEL BLACKBURN,	SAMUEL MOONEY,
THADDEUS BRUEN,	JOHN PORTER,
ROBERT CALDWELL,	EVAN SHELBY,
JAMES CARPENTER,	DANIEL SHOEMAKER,
WILLIAM CONNELL,	JOSEPH THORNTON,
MATTHIAS FOWLER,	SCOTT TRAVERS,
THOMAS GIZZELL,	JOHN VANCE,
FRANCIS HARDESTY,	SYLVESTER WHITE,
EPHRAIM KIBBY,	JOEL WILLIAMS,

HENRY LINDSEY.

Cist's "Cincinnati in 1859" adds the names of Matthias Campbell, —— Henry, Luther Kitchell, Elijah Martin, and Isaac Tuttle.

The families of the persons above named, or persons acquainted with any of them, will confer a favor by communicating to John D. Caldwell, Esq., Secretary of the Pioneer Association, Cincinnati, concerning any letters, documents, or other means for determining the time when the party from Limestone, under Messrs. Patterson and Ludlow, arrived at Cincinnati.

Families of the first settlers at Columbia, or their acquaintances, may also have means for answering the same inquiry.

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 042300977